



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/551,192	09/29/2005	Eiichi Kitazono	Q90681	3913
23373	7590	08/05/2010	EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC			PALENIK, JEFFREY T	
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 800			1615	
WASHINGTON, DC 20037				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/05/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

sughrue@sughrue.com
PPROCESSING@SUGHRUE.COM
USPTO@SUGHRUE.COM

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/551,192	KITAZONO ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Jeffrey T. Palenik	1615	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 19 July 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires ____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): See Continuation Sheet.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 7,8 and 10

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 1,2,4,6 and 12-14.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fail to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____

/Jeffrey T. Palenik/
 Examiner, Art Unit 1615

/Robert A. Wax/
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1615

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Applicants' cancellation of claim 11 is sufficient in overcoming the rejection made to claims 7 and 11 under the second paragraph of 35 USC 112.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Concerning Applicants' request that the rejection made on the grounds of provisional nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over copending Application N° 11/791,115 be held in abeyance until the instant claims are found to be allowable, the Examiner acknowledges Applicants' request and respectfully submits that the rejection will be maintained until such time as the claims are placed into condition for allowance.

Applicants' arguments with regard to the rejection of claims 7, 8 and 10 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the teachings of Schmitt et al. have been fully considered but they are not persuasive [claim 11 is cancelled on entry of the amendment].

Applicants continue to argue that "the distinct manufacturing method [is] relevant because the method used in Schmitt would not result in the product of the present invention".

In response, the Examiner respectfully disagrees and submits that Applicants' arguments concerning the distinct manufacturing methods of the Schmitt reference versus the instant composition remain irrelevant for two reasons, the more compelling of which is that no method limitations appear within the instant claims. In response to Applicants' arguments that the references fail to show certain features of Applicants' invention, it is noted that the features upon which Applicants rely (i.e., method steps for producing the instant invention) are not recited in any of the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Secondly, the instant invention is directed to a composition rather than its method for producing said composition. Absent a clear showing of evidence to the contrary, said method limitations would be considered as product-by-process limitations (MPEP §2113). For these reasons, Applicants' arguments are found unpersuasive. Said rejection is therefore maintained.